

CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT (CBD) TOLLING PROGRAM REEVALUATION

June 2024

Federal Lead Agency



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Project Sponsors



**Department of
Transportation**



Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1 Introduction	1
2 Project Description: Adopted Toll Structure	20
3 Analysis Framework: General Methodology for Reevaluation	27
4A Transportation – Regional Transportation Effects and Modeling.....	28
METHODOLOGY	28
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	29
FINDINGS	29
4B Transportation – Highways and Local Intersections.....	31
METHODOLOGY	31
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	33
FINDINGS	37
4C Transportation – Transit.....	39
METHODOLOGY	39
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	41
FINDINGS	46
4D Transportation – Parking.....	52
METHODOLOGY	52
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	52
FINDINGS	55
4E Transportation – Pedestrians and Bicycles	57
METHODOLOGY	57
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	58
FINDINGS	66
5 Social Conditions: Population Characteristics and Community Cohesion (EA Subchapter 5A), Neighborhood Character (EA Subchapter 5B), and Public Policy (EA Subchapter 5C)	68
METHODOLOGY	68
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	68
FINDINGS	71
6 Economic Conditions	74
METHODOLOGY	74
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	74
FINDINGS	81
Other Analyses: Parks and Recreational Resources (EA Chapter 7), Historic and Cultural Resources (EA Chapter 8), Visual Resources (EA Chapter 9)	84
FINDINGS	84
10 Air Quality	86
METHODOLOGY	86
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	89
FINDINGS	101

11 Energy	106
METHODOLOGY	106
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	106
FINDINGS	107
12 Noise	109
METHODOLOGY	109
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	110
FINDINGS	113
Other Analyses: Natural Resources (EA Chapter 13), Hazardous Wastes (EA Chapter 14), Construction Effects (EA Chapter 15)	116
FINDINGS	116
16 Summary of Effects.....	118
17 Environmental Justice.....	119
METHODOLOGY	119
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: LOCAL (NEIGHBORHOOD) EFFECTS	119
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: REGIONAL	120
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS: LOCAL (NEIGHBORHOOD) EFFECTS RELATED TO TRAFFIC DIVERSIONS	125
FINDINGS	162
18 Agency Coordination and Public Participation.....	168
FINAL EA AND FONSI COMMITMENTS.....	168
OTHER OUTREACH AND COORDINATION.....	172
19 Section 4(f) Evaluation.....	173
FINDINGS	173
Other Analyses: Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity (EA Chapter 20), Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources (EA Chapter 21)	174
Conclusion.....	175

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AASHTO	Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ACM	Asbestos-Containing Materials
ACS	American Community Survey
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
APE	Area of Potential Effects
ATR	Automatic Traffic Recorder
AVE	Area of Visual Effect
BID	Central Business District
BPM	Best Practice Model
BQE	Brooklyn-Queens Expressway
Btu	British thermal units
CAA	Clean Air Act
CBD	Central Business District
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CEQR	City Environmental Quality Review
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH ₄	Methane
CHASP	Construction Health and Safety Plan
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO ₂ e	CO ₂ Equivalents
CRIS	Cultural Resource Information System
CRP	Carbon Reduction Program
CTPP	Census Transportation Planning Package
dB(A)	A-weighted decibels
DMV	New York City Department of Motor Vehicles
DOHMH	New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECL	Environmental Conservation Law
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJCG	Environmental Justice Community Group
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA	East Side Access
FCA	Fare Control Area
FDR Drive	Franklin D. Roosevelt Drive
FHV	For-Hire Vehicle
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
fpm	feet per minute
GHG	Greenhouse Gas

GWBBBS	George Washington Bridge Bus Station
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HCS	Highway Capacity Software
HEI	Health Effects Institute
HEET	High Entry/Exit Turnstile
HOT	High-Occupancy Toll
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
HVFHS	high-volume for-hire services
JFK Airport	John F. Kennedy Airport
L	left turn
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
LIRR	Long Island Rail Road
LN	Late Night
LOS	Level of Service
LPC	New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission
LWCFA	Land and Water Conservation Fund Act
MD	Midday
Metro-North or MNR	Metro-North Railroad
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOVES	(USEPA) Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator
mph	miles per hour
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxics
MTA	Metropolitan Transportation Authority
N ₂ O	Nitrous Oxide
NAACP	National Association of the Advancement of Colored People
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
NATA	National Air Toxics Assessment
NB	northbound (traffic)
NBL	northbound left turn (traffic)
NBT	northbound through (traffic)
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NICE	Nassau Inter-County Express
NJT or NJ TRANSIT	New Jersey Transit Corporation
NJTPA	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NO _x	Nitrogen Oxides
NPS	National Park Service
NR	National Register of Historic Places
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTP	Non-Toll Pricing
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
NYC	New York City
NYC Parks	New York City Department of Parks and Recreation

NYCCAS	New York City Community Air Survey
NYCDCP	New York City Department of City Planning
NYCDOE	New York City Department of Education
NYCDOT	New York City Department of Transportation
NYCHD	New York City Historic District
NYCL	New York City Landmark and New York City Scenic Landmark
NYCRR	New York Codes, Rules, and Regulations
NYCT	New York City Transit
NYC TLC	New York City Traffic and Limousine Commission
NYMTC	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council
NYPD	New York City Police Department
NYSDEC	New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
NYS DOP	New York Statewide Digital Orthoimagery Program
NYS DOT	New York State Department of Transportation
NYS DTF	New York State Department of Taxation and Finance
O ₃	Ozone
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PABT	Port Authority Bus Terminal
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon
PANYNJ	Port Authority of New York and New Jersey
PATH	Port Authority Trans-Hudson
Pb	Lead
pc/mi/ln	passenger cars per mile per lane (density)
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PCE	Passenger Car Equivalent
PFAC	Program, Finance and Administration Committee
PM _{2.5} and PM ₁₀	Particulate Matter (2.5 microns and 10 microns)
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
R	right turn (traffic)
RCNY	Rules of the City of New York
RFK Bridge	Robert F. Kennedy Bridge
SAPA	New York State Administrative Procedure Act
SB	southbound (traffic)
SBR	southbound right turn (traffic)
SBS	Select Bus Service
SBT	southbound through (traffic)
SBWG	Small Business Working Group
SEQRA	State Environmental Quality Review Act
SFP	Square Feet per Pedestrian
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIE	Staten Island Expressway
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
SOC	Standard Occupational Classification
T	through (traffic)
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zones
TBTA	Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority

TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TEM.....	The Environmental Manual
TIP.....	Transportation Improvement Program
Title VI.....	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
TLC.....	New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission
TMRB	Traffic Mobility Review Board
TR	through right turn (traffic)
NICE.....	Nassau Inter-County Express
TNM	FHWA's Traffic Noise Model
TRU	transport refrigeration unit
UHF.....	United Hospital Fund
UPARRA	Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act
USACE.....	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USDOT.....	U.S. Department of Transportation
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS.....	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
v/c ratio	volume-to-capacity ratio
VCE	Vertical Circulation Element
VIA.....	Visual Impact Assessment
VMT.....	Vehicle-Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound
VPH	vehicles per hour
VPPP	Value Pricing Pilot Program
XBL	Exclusive Bus Lane
WB	westbound (traffic)
WBL.....	westbound left turn (traffic)
WSP	WSP Global Inc.
WBR	westbound right turn (traffic)
WBT.....	westbound through (traffic)
µg/m ³	micrograms per cubic meter of air

Executive Summary

FHWA’s reevaluation confirms that the adopted toll structure is within the analysis conducted in the Final Environmental Assessment and does not require additional analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) remains valid.

Background

In June 2023, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) found that New York’s Central Business District (CBD) Tolling Program (CBDTP), known as Congestion Pricing, “will have no significant impact on the human or natural environment” following an extensive review of CBDTP’s potential beneficial and adverse effects and committed mitigation, and documented in the CBDTP Final Environmental Assessment (EA). The review considered a variety of potential tolling structures with different combinations of low-to-high toll rates, crossing credits against the toll for vehicles travelling to the CBD through already-tolled bridges and tunnels, exemptions for certain types of vehicles, and other program features.¹

Since then, the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority (an affiliate of MTA and doing business as MTA Bridges and Tunnels) has adopted a toll structure, based on a recommendation of an independent advisory body, the Traffic Mobility Review Board, and conducted the required public comment period as part of New York’s rate-making State Administrative Procedures Act process.

The purpose of this reevaluation is to make sure that the effects of MTA’s adopted toll structure are consistent with the effects disclosed in the Final EA, and that the mitigation identified in FHWA’s Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) remains valid. In every category, the effects are consistent with those predicated in the Final EA; importantly, some of the adverse effects no longer occur and many are on the lower end of those disclosed in the Final EA.



The adopted toll structure is in line with the tolling scenarios studied in the Final EA

The parameters of the adopted toll structure fall within the range of tolling scenarios evaluated in the Final EA. In brief, the adopted toll structure includes the following elements:²

- Passenger vehicles and passenger-type vehicles with commercial license plates will be charged a \$15 peak-period (\$3.75 overnight period) E-ZPass toll for entering the CBD, no more than once per day.
- Trucks will be charged a \$24 or \$36 peak-period (\$6 or \$9 overnight period) E-ZPass toll for entering the CBD, depending on their size.
- School buses contracted, commuter vans, and buses providing scheduled commuter services open to the public will be exempted from the CBD toll, while other buses will be charged a \$24 or \$36 peak period (\$6 or \$9 overnight period) E-ZPass toll for entering the CBD, depending on their type.
- Motorcycles will be charged a \$7.50 peak-period (\$1.75 overnight period) E-ZPass toll for entering the CBD, no more than once per day.
- Peak-period toll rates will apply during the most congested times of the day—from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. on weekdays, and from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. on weekends. Toll rates will be 75 percent lower in the overnight period.
- A tunnel crossing credit against the peak-period CBD toll rate will be provided to vehicles with E-ZPass entering through the Queens-Midtown, Hugh L. Carey, Holland, and Lincoln Tunnels; no tunnel crossing credits will be in effect in the overnight period, when CBD toll rates are already 75 percent lower than in the peak period.

Table 1, below, compares the various elements of the adopted toll structure with the tolling scenarios studied in the Final EA.

Table 1. Tolling Scenarios Evaluated in the Final EA with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

PARAMETER	SCENARIO A	SCENARIO B	SCENARIO C	SCENARIO D	SCENARIO E	SCENARIO F	SCENARIO G	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	EXPLANATION OF HOW THE ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE FITS WITHIN THE FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS
	Base Plan	Base Plan with Caps and Exemptions	Low Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Tunnels to Access the CBD, with Some Caps and Exemptions	High Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Tunnels to Access the CBD	High Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Tunnels to Access the CBD, with Some Caps and Exemptions	High Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Manhattan Bridges and Tunnels to Access the CBD, with Some Caps and Exemptions	Base Plan with Same Tolls for All Vehicle Classes		
Time Periods ¹									
Peak: Weekdays	6 AM – 8 PM	6 AM – 8 PM	6 AM – 8 PM	6 AM – 8 PM	6 AM – 8 PM	6 AM – 10 AM; 4 PM – 8 PM	6 AM – 8 PM	5 AM – 9 PM ²	Overnight period is the same length as those modeled in the Final EA; exceeds commitment in the Final EA to include "further reduced overnight tolls ... from at least 12:00 a.m. to 4:00a.m." by charging overnight tolls between 9p.m. to 5 a.m.; reflects a reduced number of time periods for ease of customer understanding
Peak: Weekends	10 AM – 10 PM	10 AM – 10 PM	10 AM – 10 PM	10 AM – 10 PM	10 AM – 10 PM	10 AM – 10 PM	10 AM – 10 PM	9 AM – 9 PM	
Off Peak: Weekdays	8 PM – 10 PM	8 PM – 10 PM	8 PM – 10 PM	8 PM – 10 PM	8 PM – 10 PM	10 AM – 4 PM	8 PM – 10 PM	9 PM – 5 AM	
Overnight: Weekdays	10 PM – 6 AM	10 PM – 6 AM	10 PM – 6 AM	10 PM – 6 AM	10 PM – 6 AM	8 PM – 6 AM	10 PM – 6 AM		
Overnight: Weekends	10 PM – 10 AM	10 PM – 10 AM	10 PM – 10 AM	10 PM – 10 AM	10 PM – 10 AM	10 PM – 10 AM	10 PM – 10 AM	9 PM – 9 AM	
Potential Crossing Credits									
Credit Toward CBD Toll for Tolls Paid at Tunnel Entries	No	No	Yes - Low	Yes - High	Yes - High	Yes - High	No	Yes - Low	Same as Tolling Scenarios C, D, E, & F
Credit Toward CBD Toll for Tolls Paid at Bridges to Manhattan	No	No	No	No	No	Yes - High	No	No	
Potential Exemptions and Limits (Caps) on Number of Tolls per Day ^{4,5,6}									
Autos, motorcycles, and commercial vans	Once per day	Once per day	Once per day	Once per day	Once per day	Once per day	Once per day	Once per day	Same as all Final EA tolling scenarios
Taxis	No cap	Once per day	Exempt	No cap	Exempt	Once per day	No cap	\$1.25 per trip toll on trips to, within, or from the CBD	Final EA commits that "TBTA will ensure that New York City taxis and FHV's are not tolled more than once per day in the adopted CBD toll structure;" per-trip tolls for taxis and FHV's equivalent to commitment of a once-per-day charge (see note 4)
FHV's	No cap	Once per day	Three times per day	No cap	Three times per day	Once per day	No cap	\$2.50 per trip toll on trips to, within, or from the CBD	
Small and large trucks	No cap	Twice per day	No cap	No cap	No cap	Once per day	No cap	No cap	Same as Tolling Scenarios A, C, D, E, and G
Buses	No cap	Exempt	No cap	No cap	Transit buses – Exempt No cap on other buses	Exempt	No cap	Certain buses – Exempt (see note 5)	Same as Tolling Scenario E

PARAMETER	SCENARIO A	SCENARIO B	SCENARIO C	SCENARIO D	SCENARIO E	SCENARIO F	SCENARIO G	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	EXPLANATION OF HOW THE ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE FITS WITHIN THE FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS
	Base Plan	Base Plan with Caps and Exemptions	Low Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Tunnels to Access the CBD, with Some Caps and Exemptions	High Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Tunnels to Access the CBD	High Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Tunnels to Access the CBD, with Some Caps and Exemptions	High Crossing Credits for Vehicles Using Manhattan Bridges and Tunnels to Access the CBD, with Some Caps and Exemptions	Base Plan with Same Tolls for All Vehicle Classes		
Approximate Toll Rate Assumed for Autos, Commercial Vans, and Motorcycles ³									
Peak	\$9	\$10	\$14	\$19	\$23	\$23	\$12	\$15	Within the range of \$9 - \$23 Lower than range in the Final EA; closest to Tolling Scenarios A and B at \$5; exceeds commitment in the Final EA to include "further reduced overnight tolls at or below 50 percent..." by reducing peak toll by 75 percent
Off Peak	\$7	\$8	\$11	\$14	\$17	\$17	\$9	\$3.75	
Overnight	\$5	\$5	\$7	\$10	\$12	\$12	\$7	\$3.75	
Approximate Toll Rate Assumed for Trucks (Small Trucks/Large Trucks) ³									
Peak	\$18 / \$28	\$20 / \$30	\$28 / \$42	\$38 / \$57	\$46 / \$69	\$65 / \$82	\$12 / \$12	\$24 / \$36	Within the range of \$12 - \$65 (small trucks) / \$12 - \$82 (large trucks)
Off Peak	\$14 / \$21	\$15 / \$23	\$21 / \$32	\$29 / \$43	\$35 / \$52	\$49 / \$62	\$9 / \$9		
Overnight	\$9 / \$14	\$10 / \$15	\$14 / \$21	\$19 / \$29	\$23 / \$35	\$33 / \$41	\$7 / \$7	\$6 / \$9	Toll rates lower than range of rates presented in the Final EA; exceeds commitment in the Final EA to include "further reduced overnight tolls at or below 50 percent..." by reducing peak toll by 75 percent

Notes:

¹ Tolls would be higher during peak periods when traffic is greatest. All Final EA tolling scenarios and the adopted toll structure include a higher toll on designated “Gridlock Alert” days, although the modeling conducted for the Project does not reflect this higher toll since it considers typical days rather than days with unusually high traffic levels.

² The adopted toll structure has a simplified two-time-period structure (i.e., peak and overnight) on weekdays, as opposed to the three-time-period (i.e., peak, off-peak, and overnight) weekday structures studied in the Final EA. As there is no longer an off-peak period on weekdays, the weekday peak and overnight periods are longer than those studied in the Final EA. The transportation modeling conducted for the adopted toll structure accounts for this change in the peak and off-peak periods and thus the model results reflect this change.

³ Toll rates are for vehicles using E-ZPass and are rounded. For all tolling scenarios, different rates would apply for vehicles not using E-ZPass.

⁴ The Final EA provides information on the types of vehicles licensed by the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC) in Chapter 6, “Economic Conditions,” Section 6.3.2.6, on page 6-32. These include yellow cabs, for which TLC has issued medallions; green cabs, which are street-hail livery cabs that begin their trips outside the core service area of Manhattan; and FHV, which provide pre-arranged service. Vehicles licensed as app-based, or high-volume, FHV operate from bases that dispatch more than 10,000 trips a day. (<https://www.nyc.gov/site/tlc/businesses/high-volume-for-hire-services.page>). Currently there are two TLC-licensed high-volume FHV: Lyft and Uber. In this reevaluation document and the Final EA, the term “taxi” is used to refer to yellow cabs, green cabs, and FHV that are not high-volume FHV and the term “FHV” refers to app-based, high-volume FHV (i.e., Lyft and Uber).

⁵ The per-trip tolls for taxis and FHV in the adopted toll structure would be equivalent to the auto peak rate of \$15 (based on NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission analysis of trips made by TLC-licensed vehicles in May 2023: for taxis the average number of trips with passengers to/from/within the CBD is 12, and for FHV it is 6).

⁶ With the adopted toll structure, qualifying authorized emergency vehicles and qualifying vehicles transporting people with disabilities would be exempt from the toll. Specialized government vehicles would also be exempt. School buses contracted with the NYC Department of Education, commuter vans licensed with the NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission, and buses providing scheduled commuter services open to the public would also be exempt from the toll.

Environmental justice mitigation commitments

The Final EA approved by FHWA in June 2023 addressed any potential adverse environmental effects from Congestion Pricing by committing to mitigation measures. It also concluded that Congestion Pricing would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on environmental justice communities or populations with the commitment to both place-based mitigation measures in potentially impacted environmental justice census tracts, and other mitigation measures designed to benefit the entire region, including low-income drivers. The value of those measures was \$207.5M over five years.

The adopted toll structure deepens the value of two of the mitigation measures described in the Final EA. It increased the low-income discount; it also both extended the overnight period beyond the commitment in the Final EA and deepened the overnight discount. With those additions, the total mitigation commitment made by the Project increased, from \$207.5M to \$330M.



1. Place-based mitigation

The reevaluation reaffirms the commitment to \$100M in funding for place-based mitigation to those environmental justice communities that (a) could see increased truck traffic proximity, and that (b) have at least one pollutant burden AND at least one chronic disease burden at or above the 90th percentile compared to the nation as a whole.

The reevaluation confirms that the adopted toll structure will affect the same 13 environmental justice communities as those identified in the Final EA: Crotona–Tremont, High Bridge–Morrisania, Hunts Point–Mott Haven, Northeast Bronx, Pelham–Throgs Neck, Downtown Brooklyn–Fort Greene, South Williamsburg, East Harlem, Randall’s Island, Newark, Orange, East Orange and Fort Lee. With the tolling structure now formally adopted, the amount of funding for each mitigation measure has been allocated to the affected EJ communities, in direct proportion with the population within the affected census tracts.

Place-based mitigation measures include:

- \$15M to replace diesel-powered Transport Refrigeration Units at Hunts Point Produce Market in the Bronx.
- \$20M to establish an asthma center and case management program in the Bronx.
- \$20M to implement electric truck charging infrastructure in New York City, which also has regional benefits: although the charging points can only be located in New York State because they are funded by NYSDOT, all trucks may use the charging points regardless of their points of origin or destination.

- \$10M to install air filtration units in schools near highways in any of the affected communities regionwide.
- \$10M to install roadside vegetation in any of the affected communities regionwide.
- \$25M to renovate parks and greenspace in any of the affected communities regionwide.

2. Low-income discount

The adopted toll structure increased the discount available to low-income drivers, regardless of their place of residence, from 25 percent to 50 percent. This mitigation commitment is for a total of \$82.0M over five years and will benefit all low-income drivers in the region and beyond.

3. Regional mitigation

The reevaluation reaffirms the mitigation measures made in the Final EA, that have benefits throughout the region. Those measures include:

- \$123M to deeply discount the overnight toll so as to reduce diversions and encourage off hours truck deliveries (an increase in both the time period in which the discount is available and the depth of the discount).
- \$20M to expand the NYC Clean Trucks Program; participation in the program is open to trucks with more than 70 percent of their vehicle miles traveled in the tri-state area (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut).
- \$5M to expand the NYCDOT Off-Hours Delivery Program; The program is available to all trucks regardless of their points of origin or destination.

Summary of Effects

The reevaluation considers 20 areas of analysis. In 16 of those areas, the reevaluation finds that the Program will benefit communities or create no adverse effects: the regional transportation system, parking, social conditions (in terms of population, neighborhood character, public policy), economic conditions, energy, parks and recreational resources, historic and cultural resources, visual resources; air quality; noise; natural resources; hazardous waste/contaminated materials; and construction effects.

In four areas of analysis, the reevaluation, like the Final EA, found some potential adverse effects: highways and intersections; transit; pedestrian and bicycles. It also considered the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects on environmental justice communities and populations. The Program includes significant mitigation commitments by the MTA, NYCDOT, and NYSDOT. These include committing \$330 million in measures to mitigate the impact that the toll might have on low-income residents and communities across the region, with a special focus on environmental justice communities. The Project Sponsors have also committed to monitoring effects of the Program as it is implemented so that adjustments can be made if warranted (known as adaptive management).

The following tables describe the effects of the adopted toll structure, and compare them to the effects of the seven tolling scenarios analyzed in the Final EA. More detail can be found in **Table 1.1** of the reevaluation.

Transportation: Regional Transportation Effects and Modeling

TOPIC	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	MITIGATION NEEDED
Vehicle Volumes	% Increase or decrease in daily vehicles entering the Manhattan CBD relative to No Action Alternative	-15% to -20%	-17%	None
Auto Journeys to CBD	% Increase or decrease in worker auto journeys to Manhattan CBD relative to No Action Alternative	-5% to -11%	-6%	None
Truck Trips Through CBD	% Increase or decrease in daily truck trips through Manhattan CBD (without origin or destination in the CBD) relative to No Action Alternative	-21% to -81%	-55%	None
Transit Journeys	% Increase or decrease in daily Manhattan CBD-related transit journeys relative to No Action Alternative	+1.2% to +2.5%	+1.6%	None
Traffic Results / Manhattan CBD	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	-9.2% to -7.1%	-8.9%	None
Traffic Results / NYC non-CBD	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	-1.0% to -0.2%	-0.4%	None
Traffic Results / North of NYC	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	-0.8% to -0.2%	-0.4%	None
Traffic Results / Long Island	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	-0.2% to +0.1%	0.0%	None
Traffic Results / New Jersey	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	0.0% to +0.2%	+0.1%	None
Traffic Results / Connecticut	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	-0.2% to 0.0%	-0.3%	None

Transportation: Highways and Local Intersections

TOPIC	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	ADDITIONAL MITIGATION NEEDED
Traffic – 10 Highway Segments / AM	0 out of 10 highway corridors in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D)	1 out of 10 highway corridors (Westbound Long Island Expressway (I-495) near the Queens-Midtown Tunnel); for some drivers, these increases will be offset by travel time savings within the CBD.	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.
Traffic – 10 Highway Segments / midday	2 out of 10 highway corridors in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D), as well as Tolling Scenarios E and F	1 out of 10 highway corridors (approaches to westbound George Washington Bridge on I-95); for some drivers, these increases will be offset by travel time savings within the CBD.	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.
Traffic – 10 Highway Segments / PM	1 out of 10 highway corridors in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D), as well as Tolling Scenarios E and F	1 out of 10 highway corridors (Southbound and northbound FDR Drive between East 10th Street and Brooklyn Bridge); for some drivers, these increases will be offset by travel time savings within the CBD.	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.
Intersections - 4 locations	4 locations in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D), as well as Tolling Scenarios E and F	1 location: East 125th Street at Second Avenue (PM)	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.

Transportation: Transit

TOPIC / TRANSIT RIDERSHIP	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	MITIGATION NEEDED
NYCT subways	% Increase or decrease in total AM peak period boardings systemwide	+1.5% to +2.0%	+1.7%	None. No adverse effects.
PATH		+0.8% to +2.0%	+1.3%	None. No adverse effects.
LIRR		+0.6% to +2.0%	+1.0%	None. No adverse effects.
Metro-North		+0.6% to +1.9%	+1.4%	None. No adverse effects.
NJ TRANSIT commuter rail		+0.3% to +2.3%	+0.9%	None. No adverse effects.
MTA/NYCT buses		+1.2% to +1.6%	+1.3%	None. No adverse effects.
NJTRANSIT Bus		+0.5% to +1.1%	+0.9%	None. No adverse effects.
Other bus		0.0% to +0.9%	+0.2%	None. No adverse effects.
Ferries		+2.5% to +3.6%	+2.9%	None. No adverse effects.
Roosevelt Island Tram		+1.7% to +2.6%	+2.9%	None. No adverse effects.

TOPIC / BUS PASSENGER LOADS	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	MITIGATION NEEDED
Manhattan local bus	% Increase or decrease at maximum passenger load point	+0.5% to +1.2%	+0.5%	None. No adverse effects.
Bronx express bus		-1.6% to +2.2%	+0.6%	None. No adverse effects.
Queens local & express bus via QBB		+2.0% to +2.8%	+2.2%	None. No adverse effects.
Queens express bus via QMT		+0.2% to +1.1%	+0.5%	None. No adverse effects.
Brooklyn local & express bus		+0.6% to +2.6%	+0.5%	None. No adverse effects.
Staten Island express bus via Brooklyn		+3.5% to +4.5%	+3.9%	None. No adverse effects.
Staten Island express bus via NJ		+1.0% to +2.8%	+1.3%	None. No adverse effects.
NJ / West of Hudson bus via Holland Tunnel		-1.4% to +1.4%	+1.9%	None. No adverse effects.
NJ / West of Hudson bus via Lincoln Tunnel		+0.4% to +1.5%	+0.8%	None. No adverse effects.

TOPIC / TRANSIT ELEMENTS	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	ADDITIONAL MITIGATION NEEDED
Hoboken PATH station stair 01/02	Net passenger increases at stair in the peak hour	45 to 240	140	No adverse effect predicted. Mitigation in Final EA will still be implemented, as an enhancement.
42 St-Times Square–subway station (Manhattan) Stair ML6/ML8		40 to 71	43	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.
Flushing-Main St subway station (Queens)–Escalator E456		40 to 74	61	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.
Union Sq subway station (Manhattan)–Escalator E219		14 to 23	18	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.
Court Sq subway station (Queens)–Stair P2/P4		117 to 152	122	No. Mitigation in Final EA is sufficient.

Air Quality

TOPIC / POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS ACROSS 12 COUNTIES*	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	MITIGATION NEEDED
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	% Increase or decrease in criteria pollutants	-0.2%	-0.4%	No
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)		-0.4%	-0.5%	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)		-0.3%	-0.7%	
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)		-1.0%	-1.0%	
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})		-0.7%	-0.8%	
Carbon Dioxide Equivalents (CO ₂ e)		-0.6%	-0.6%	

* Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), New York (Manhattan), Queens, Richmond (Staten Island), Nassau, Suffolk, Putnam, Rockland, and Westchester Counties, New York; Bergen and Hudson Counties, New Jersey.

TOPIC / EMISSIONS “HOT SPOT” ANALYSIS	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	MITIGATION NEEDED
Cross Bronx Expressway at Macombs Road, Bronx, NY	Increase or decrease in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)	+1,766 to +3,996 (+1% to +2%)	+3,917 (+2%)	No
	Increase or decrease in daily number of trucks	+50 to +704 (+0% to +3%)	+433 (+2%)	
	Potential adverse air quality effects from truck diversions	No	No, PM ₁₀ & PM _{2.5} do not exceed NAAQS	
I-95, West of the GWB, Bergen County, NJ	Increase or decrease in AADT	+5,003 to +12,506 (+2% to +5%)	+10,341 (+4%)	No
	Increase or decrease in daily number of trucks	-236 to +955 (-1% to +3%)	+499 (+1%)	
	Potential adverse air quality effects from truck diversions	No	No, PM ₁₀ & PM _{2.5} do not exceed NAAQS	
RFK Bridge, NY	Increase or decrease in AADT	+18,742 to +21,006 (+13% to +15%)	+20,273 (+14%)	No
	Increase or decrease in daily number of trucks	+432 to +4,116 (+3% to +27%)	+2,433 (+16%)	
	Potential adverse air quality effects from truck diversions	No	No, PM ₁₀ & PM _{2.5} do not exceed NAAQS	

In addition to the regional and highway “hot spot” analysis, the Final EA and reevaluation assessed the potential effects of emissions from vehicles at 102 intersections across Manhattan, Long Island City, Downtown Brooklyn, and Jersey City near the Holland Tunnel.

All 102 intersections passed screening for air quality effects in both the Final EA and the reevaluation.

Transportation: Parking

Both the Final EA and reevaluation found that CBDTP would have beneficial effects for parking in the CBD since auto trips to the CBD are anticipated to decrease.

Though parking demand at some transit facilities outside the CBD would increase with increased transit ridership, the Final EA and reevaluation found that these increases would be small enough not to generate adverse effects.

Social Conditions

- Access to Employment
 - The vast majority of commuters to the CBD currently use transit.
 - Those who drive despite the CBD toll would do so based on the need or convenience of driving and would benefit from the reduced congestion in the Manhattan CBD.

- There would be a negligible effect (less than 0.1 percent) on travel to employment within the Manhattan CBD and reverse-commuting from the CBD due to the wide range of transit options available and the small number of commuters who drive today.
- Vulnerable Populations
 - Both the Final EA and reevaluation found that CBDTP would benefit vulnerable social groups, including elderly populations, persons with disabilities, transit-dependent populations, and non-driver populations, by funding transit improvements and by improving bus travel times and reliability (bus passengers tend to be older than riders on other forms of transit, such as the subway).
 - People over the age of 65 with a qualifying disability are eligible for reduced fare on MTA subways and buses and may also receive MTA’s paratransit service, including taxis and for-hire vehicles (FHV) operating on behalf of MTA.
 - Elderly people with disabilities and low-income individuals who drive to the Manhattan CBD would be entitled to the same mitigation and enhancements proposed for low-income and disabled populations, in general.

Economic Conditions

- The Final EA and reevaluation found economic benefits from CBDTP through travel-time savings and travel-time reliability improvements, as well as reduced vehicle operating costs.
- As found in the Final EA, the adopted toll structure is not anticipated to result in meaningful change in cost for most consumer goods.
- Any cost increase associated with the new toll would be passed along to several business customers, minimizing costs to any individual business.
- No adverse effects were found for any particular industry or sector of the labor force in the Manhattan CBD, including the taxi/FHV industry.
- Transit access in the CBD is high and a high percentage of workers commute by transit; thus, the toll would affect only a small percentage of the overall workforce.
- The potential decrease in taxi/FHV VMT across the region and within the Manhattan CBD under the adopted toll structure is much smaller than the largest potential decreases predicted in the Final EA.

TOPIC / TAXI AND FHV INDUSTRY	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	MITIGATION NEEDED
Regionwide	% change in daily taxi/FHV VMT	-5.0% to -0.1%	-0.7%	No; (see “Environmental Justice” for mitigation related to effects on taxi and FHV drivers).
In the Manhattan CBD		-16.8% to +4.6%	-0.3%	

Environmental Justice

- A very small minority of low-income commuters to the CBD drive; many more take transit.
- Low-income drivers to the Manhattan CBD would have increased costs in adopted toll structure, as they would under the scenarios studied in the Final EA; with the adopted toll structure, MTA, NYCDOT, and NYSDOT have committed to a low-income discount that is double what was committed to in the Final EA.
- Taxi and FHV drivers have potential decreases in VMT in the CBD under the adopted toll structure that are smaller than the largest decreases found in the Final EA; this is possible because the adopted toll structure includes per-trip fees that are equivalent to the once-per-day toll cap that the Final EA found would not have, based on detailed data, disproportionately high and adverse effects on taxi/FHV drivers.
- As expected, the census tracts with pre-existing air pollutant and chronic disease burdens that would benefit from reduced traffic, and those affected by increased traffic from vehicles diverting around the CBD, vary somewhat from the Final EA under the adopted toll structure, but the communities remain the same.
- A package of regional and place-based investments, described above, will mitigate these effects.

The adopted toll structure meets the purpose and need of reducing traffic congestion in the CBD, while generating revenue for future transportation improvements

SCREENING CRITERION	CBD TOLLING (ACTION) ALTERNATIVE FINAL EA SCENARIOS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE
Purpose and Need: Reduce traffic congestion in the Manhattan CBD in a manner that will generate revenue for future transportation improvements	MEETS	MEETS
Objective 1: Reduce daily vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) within the Manhattan CBD Criterion: Reduce by 5% (relative to No Action)	MEETS	MEETS
Daily VMT reduction (2023)	7.1% - 9.2%	8.9%
Objective 2: Reduce the number of vehicles entering the Manhattan CBD daily Criterion: Reduce by 10% (relative to No Action)	MEETS	MEETS
Daily vehicle reduction (2023)	15.4% - 19.9%	17.3%
Objective 3: Create a funding source for capital improvements and generate sufficient annual net revenues to fund \$15 billion for capital projects for MTA's Capital Program	MEETS ¹	MEETS
Net revenue to support MTA's Capital Program ²	\$1.0 billion - \$1.5 billion	\$0.9 billion
Objective 4: Establish a tolling program consistent with the purposes underlying the New York State legislation entitled the "MTA Reform and Traffic Mobility Act"	MEETS	MEETS

Notes:

- 1 Although Final EA Tolling Scenario B would not meet Objective 3 with the toll rates identified and assessed in the Final EA, additional analysis was conducted to demonstrate that it would meet this objective with a higher toll rate; the resulting VMT reduction and revenue for that modified scenario would fall within the range of the other Final EA scenarios.
- 2 The net revenue needed to fund \$15 billion depends on a number of economic factors, including but not limited to interest rates and term. For the purposes of the Final EA, the modeling assumes the Project should provide at least \$1 billion annually in total net revenue, which would be invested or bonded to generate sufficient funds. The net revenue values provided in this table are rounded and based on Project modeling. Following completion of the Final EA, based on current interest rates and expected timing of projects, MTA's Chief Financial Officer has determined that annual net revenues in the range of \$0.9 billion should be sufficient to meet the Project's need to fund \$15 billion of capital projects for the MTA Capital Program.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Federal Highway Administration. June, 2023. "Finding of No Significant Impact: Central Business District (CBD) Tolling Program." Available at <https://new.mta.info/document/114186>; for more information on the federal environmental review process that led to this Finding, including information on why a federal environmental review was necessary, refer to the "Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)" page on the MTA CBD Tolling Program web site at <https://new.mta.info/project/CBDTP/environmental-assessment>.
- 2 For more detail, see the "Congestion Relief Zone, Tolling Information" page at <https://congestionreliefzone.mta.info/tolling>.

1 Introduction

In June 2023, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Central Business District (CBD) Tolling Program. The FONSI was based on the April 2023 Final Environmental Assessment (EA), with committed mitigation.

At that time, seven tolling scenarios were presented in the Final EA and FONSI representing a range of toll structures to evaluate their ability to meet the needs of the Project and the resultant environmental effects. The Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Reform and Traffic Mobility Act (the Act) requires that a Traffic Mobility Review Board (TMRB) be established to recommend a toll structure to the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority (TBTA) Board, in order for the TBTA Board to thereafter propose and adopt a toll structure through a state ratemaking process pursuant to New York’s State Administrative Procedure Act (SAPA). Accordingly, the seven tolling scenarios, were developed with different assumptions regarding toll rates, peak periods, and potential discounts, exemptions, and crossing credits, in order to explore and disclose the range of effects that could occur as a result of the CBD Tolling Program. Recognizing that the TMRB could recommend a toll structure that mirrored one of the tolling scenarios, or could recommend different parameters, and that the TBTA Board could choose to adopt a different toll structure, the FONSI contemplated a reevaluation, prepared pursuant to 23 CFR § 771, once the TBTA Board adopted the CBD Tolling Program toll structure.¹

In November 2023, the TMRB issued a report detailing its tolling recommendations. In accordance with SAPA, the TBTA Board authorized the TMRB’s tolling recommendations to be filed in the form of a proposed toll structure, and held a public comment period that included four public hearings. On March 27, 2024, the TBTA Board voted to adopt a final schedule of toll rates as well as associated exemptions, crossing credits, and discounts, referred to in this reevaluation as the “adopted toll structure.” The adopted toll structure is the same as recommended by the TMRB with several clarifications incorporated.

The TBTA-adopted toll structure is being reevaluated to determine if the FONSI is still valid. This requires that TBTA demonstrate to FHWA that the effects of the adopted toll structure are consistent with the effects disclosed in the Final EA and that the mitigation is still valid.

The following sections provide the results of analyses conducted for the reevaluation. For ease of comparison, the sections follow the same order for the resource area analyses as the Final EA. Where appropriate, and to provide context, tables with analysis results from the Final EA are provided, side by side with the results of the adopted toll structure.

¹ Federal Highway Administration, *Finding of No Significant Impact, Central Business District (CBD) Tolling Program*, <https://new.mta.info/document/114186>, p. 26.

Table 1.1 provides a summary of the effects of the adopted toll structure in comparison to the effects presented in the Final EA. The table is a re-creation of the table that was provided in the Final EA as Table ES-5 and Table 16-1, now modified to include the adopted toll structure.

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
4A – Transportation: Regional Transportation Effects and Modeling	Vehicle Volumes	▪ Decreases in daily vehicle trips to Manhattan CBD overall.	Crossing locations to Manhattan CBD	% Increase or decrease in daily vehicles entering the Manhattan CBD relative to No Action Alternative	-15%	-16%	-17%	-19%	-20%	-18%	-17%	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	-17%	No	No mitigation needed. Same as Final EA
	Auto Journeys to CBD	▪ Some diversions to different crossings to Manhattan CBD or around the Manhattan CBD altogether, depending on tolling scenario. As traffic, including truck trips, increase on some circumferential highways, simultaneously there is a reduction in traffic on other highway segments to the CBD.	Manhattan CBD	% Increase or decrease in worker auto journeys to Manhattan CBD relative to No Action Alternative	-5%	-5%	-7%	-9%	-11%	-10%	-6%	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	-6%	No	No mitigation needed. Same as Final EA
				Absolute increase or decrease in daily worker auto trips to Manhattan CBD relative to No Action Alternative	-12,571	-12,883	-17,408	-24,017	-27,471	-24,433	-14,578			-16,447		
	Truck Trips Through CBD		Manhattan CBD	Increase or decrease in daily truck trips through Manhattan CBD (without origin or destination in the CBD) relative to No Action Alternative	-4,645 (-55%)	-4,967 (-59%)	-5,253 (-63%)	-5,687 (-68%)	-6,604 (-79%)	-6,784 (-81%)	-1,734 (-21%)	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	-4,627 (-55%)	No	No mitigation needed. Same as Final EA
	Transit Journeys	▪ Diversions would increase or decrease traffic volumes at local intersections near the Manhattan CBD crossings.	Manhattan CBD	% Increase or decrease in daily Manhattan CBD-related transit journeys relative to No Action Alternative	+1.2%	+1.2%	+1.7%	+2.2%	+2.5%	+2.1%	+1.5%	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	+1.6%	No	No mitigation needed. Same as Final EA
	Traffic Results	▪ Overall decrease in vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) in the Manhattan CBD and region overall in all tolling scenarios and some shift from vehicle to transit mode.	Manhattan CBD	% Increase or decrease in daily VMT relative to No Action Alternative	-7.8%	-7.6%	-8.0%	-8.7%	-9.2%	-7.1%	-8.4%	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects in Manhattan CBD, New York City (non-CBD), north of New York City, and Connecticut; although there would be VMT increases in Long Island and New Jersey, the effects would not be adverse.	-8.9%	No	No mitigation needed. Same as Final EA
			NYC (non-CBD)		-0.3%	-0.2%	-0.7%	-0.9%	-1.0%	-0.7%	-0.3%			-0.4%		
			NY north of NYC		-0.2%	-0.2%	-0.4%	-0.6%	-0.8%	-0.5%	-0.3%			-0.4%		
			Long Island		+0.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	-0.2%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%			0.0%		
			New Jersey		+0.0%	+0.0%	+0.2%	+0.2%	+0.1%	+0.2%	+0.1%			+0.1%		
			Connecticut		-0.1%	-0.2%	-0.2%	-0.2%	-0.2%	0.0%	-0.2%			-0.3%		

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
4B – Transportation: Highways and Local Intersections	Traffic – Highway Segments	<p>The introduction of the CBD Tolling Program may produce increased congestion on highway segments approaching on circumferential roadways used to avoid Manhattan CBD tolls, resulting in increased delays and queues in midday and PM peak hours on certain segments in some tolling scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Westbound Long Island Expressway (I-495) near the Queens-Midtown Tunnel (midday)Approaches to westbound George Washington Bridge on I-95 (midday)Southbound and northbound Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) Drive between East 10th Street and Brooklyn Bridge (PM)Other locations will see an associated decrease in congestion particularly on routes approaching the Manhattan CBD	<div>10 highway segments (AM)</div> <div>10 highway segments (midday)</div> <div>10 highway segments (PM)</div>	<div>Highway segments with increased delays and queues in peak hours that would result in adverse effects</div>	<div>0 out of 10 highway corridors in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D)</div> <div>2 out of 10 highway corridors in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D), as well as Tolling Scenarios E and F</div> <div>1 out of 10 highway corridors in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D), as well as Tolling Scenarios E and F</div>							Yes	<p>Mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors will implement a monitoring plan prior to implementation with post-implementation data collected approximately three months after the start of tolling operations and including thresholds for effects; if the thresholds are reached or crossed, the Project Sponsors will implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, such as ramp metering, motorist information, signage at all identified highway locations with adverse effects upon implementation of the Project. New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) owns and maintains the relevant segments of the Long Island Expressway and I-95. The relevant segment of the FDR Drive is owned by NYSDOT south of Montgomery Street and New York City Department of Transportation (NYCDOT) north of Montgomery Street. Implementation of TDM measures will be coordinated between the highway owners and the owners of any assets relevant to implementing the TDM.</p> <p>Post-implementation of TDM measures, the Project Sponsors will monitor effects and, if needed, TBTA will modify the toll rates, crossing credits, exemptions, and/or discounts to reduce adverse effects.</p>	<div>AM - 1 out of 10 highway corridors (Westbound Long Island Expressway (I-495) near the Queens-Midtown Tunnel); for some drivers, these increases will be offset by travel time savings within the CBD.</div> <div>Midday - 1 out of 10 highway corridors (approaches to westbound George Washington Bridge on I-95); for some drivers, these increases will be offset by travel time savings within the CBD.</div> <div>PM - 1 out of 10 highway corridors (southbound and northbound FDR Drive between East 10th Street and Brooklyn Bridge); for some drivers, these increases will be offset by travel time savings within the CBD.</div>	Yes	<p>No additional mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors will implement the mitigation commitments of the Final EA.</p>
	Intersections	<p>Shifts in traffic patterns, with increases in traffic at some locations and decreases at other locations, would change conditions at some local intersections within and near the Manhattan CBD. Of the 102 intersections analyzed, most intersections would see reductions in delay.</p> <p>Potential adverse effects on four local intersections in Manhattan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Trinity Place and Edgar Street (midday)East 36th Street and Second Avenue (midday)East 37th Street and Third Avenue (midday)East 125th Street and Second Avenue (AM, PM)	4 locations	<div>Number of locations with potential adverse effects that will be addressed with signal timing adjustments</div>	<div>4 in the analyzed tolling scenario (Tolling Scenario D), as well as Tolling Scenarios E and F</div>							Yes	<p>Mitigation needed. NYCDOT will monitor those intersections where potential adverse effects were identified and implement appropriate signal timing adjustments to mitigate the effect, per NYCDOT's normal practice.</p> <p>Enhancement Refer to the overall enhancement on monitoring at the end of this table.</p>	<div>Potential adverse effects at 1 location: East 125th Street at Second Avenue (PM)</div>	Yes	<p>No additional mitigation needed. The mitigation commitment remains for East 125th Street at Second Avenue; for the other three locations identified in the Final EA, NYCDOT is maintaining the commitment to implement the measures identified in the Final EA as an enhancement.</p>

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
4C – Transportation: Transit	Transit Systems	The Project would generate a dedicated revenue source for investment in the transit system. Transit ridership would increase by 1 to 2 percent systemwide for travel to and from the Manhattan CBD, because some people would shift to transit rather than driving. Increases in transit ridership would not result in adverse effects on line-haul capacity on any transit routes.	New York City Transit	% Increase or decrease in total AM peak period boardings systemwide	1.5%	1.6%	1.7%	1.9%	2.0%	1.9%	1.8%	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	1.7%	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
			Port Authority Trans-Hudson (PATH)		0.8%	0.7%	1.4%	1.6%	2.0%	1.8%	1.6%			1.3%		
			Long Island Rail Road (LIRR)		0.6%	0.9%	1.1%	1.5%	2.0%	1.3%	1.0%			1.0%		
			Metro-North Railroad		0.6%	0.8%	1.3%	1.7%	1.4%	1.9%	0.8%			1.4%		
			NJ TRANSIT commuter rail		0.3%	0.5%	1.0%	1.5%	2.3%	1.7%	1.0%			0.9%		
			MTA/New York City Transit (NYCT) buses		1.3%	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.2%			1.3%		
			NJ TRANSIT bus		0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	1.1%	1.0%	0.7%			0.9%		
			Other buses (suburban and private operators)		0.2%	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%			0.2%		
			Ferries (Staten Island Ferry, NYC Ferry, NY Waterway, Seastreak)		2.5%	2.7%	3.1%	3.2%	3.1%	3.6%	2.7%			2.9%		
			Roosevelt Island Tram		1.8%	1.7%	2.0%	2.2%	2.6%	2.5%	1.7%			2.9%		
	Bus System Effects	Decreases in traffic volumes within the Manhattan CBD and near the 60th Street boundary of the Manhattan CBD would reduce the roadway congestion that adversely affects bus operations, facilitating more reliable, faster bus trips.	Manhattan local buses	% Increase or decrease at maximum passenger load point	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	1.1%	1.2%	0.9%	0.7%	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	0.5%	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
			Bronx express buses		-1.6%	2.0%	2.2%	-0.5%	2.0%	1.5%	-2.5%			0.6%		
			Queens local and express buses (via Ed Koch Queensboro Bridge)		2.2%	2.0%	2.3%	2.3%	2.5%	2.8%	2.0%			2.2%		
			Queens express buses (via Queens-Midtown Tunnel)		0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%	0.6%			0.5%		
			Brooklyn local and express buses		0.8%	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	2.6%			0.5%		
			Staten Island express routes (via Brooklyn)		4.0%	4.5%	4.4%	3.8%	3.9%	3.7%	3.5%			3.9%		
			Staten Island express routes (via NJ)		1.0%	1.9%	2.3%	2.8%	1.8%	1.8%	2.4%			1.3%		
			NJ/West of Hudson buses (via Holland Tunnel)		-1.4%	-0.9%	-0.3%	1.4%	-0.9%	-0.6%	-1.4%			1.9%*		
			NJ/West of Hudson buses (via Lincoln Tunnel)		0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.6%			0.8%		

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
4C – Transportation: Transit (Cont'd)	Transit Elements	<p>Increased ridership would affect passenger flows with the potential for adverse effects at certain vertical circulation elements (i.e., stairs and escalators) in five transit stations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Hoboken Terminal, Hoboken, NJ PATH station▪ Times Sq-42 St/42 St-Port Authority Bus Terminal subway station in the Manhattan CBD (N, Q, R, W, and S; Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 7; and A, C, E lines)▪ Flushing-Main St subway station, Queens (No. 7 line)▪ 14th Street-Union Square subway station in the Manhattan CBD (Nos. 4, 5, and 6; and L, N, Q, R, W lines)▪ Court Square subway station, Queens (No. 7 and E, G, M lines)	Hoboken Terminal–PATH station (NJ) Stair 01/02	Net passenger increases at stair in the peak hour vs. No Action Alternative	45	72	122	164	240	205	139	Yes	Mitigation needed for Tolling Scenarios E and F. TBTA will coordinate with NJ TRANSIT and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ) to monitor pedestrian volumes on Stair 01/02 one month prior to commencing tolling operations to establish a baseline, and two months after Project operations begin. If a comparison of Stair 01/02 passenger volumes before and after implementation shows an incremental change that is greater than or equal to 205, then TBTA will coordinate with NJ TRANSIT and PANYNJ to implement improved signage and wayfinding to divert some people from Stair 01/02, and supplemental personnel if needed.	140	No	No mitigation needed. TBTA is maintaining its commitment to implement the mitigation measures identified in the Final EA, including monitoring and improvements, if warranted, as an enhancement.
			42 St-Times Square–subway station (Manhattan) Stair ML6/ML8 connecting mezzanine to uptown 1/2/3 lines subway platform	Net passenger increases at stair in the peak hour vs. No Action Alternative	45	42	48	58	71	58	40	Yes	Mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement a monitoring plan for this location. The plan will identify a baseline, specific timing, and a threshold for additional action. If that threshold is reached, TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to remove the center handrail and standardize the riser, so that the stair meets code without the hand rail. The threshold will be set to allow for sufficient time to implement the mitigation so that the adverse effect does not occur.	43	Yes	No additional mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement the mitigation commitments of the Final EA, including monitoring and improvements, if warranted.
			Flushing-Main St subway station (Queens)–Escalator E456 connecting street to mezzanine level	Net passenger increases at stair in the peak hour vs. No Action Alternative	65	51	60	65	56	74	40	Yes	Mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement a monitoring plan for this location. The plan will identify a baseline, specific timing, and a threshold for additional action. If that threshold is reached, MTA NYCT will increase the speed from 100 feet per minute (fpm) to 120 fpm.	61	Yes	No additional mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement the mitigation commitments of the Final EA, including monitoring and improvements, if warranted.
			Union Sq subway station (Manhattan)–Escalator E219 connecting the L subway line platform to the Nos. 4/5/6 line mezzanine	Net passenger increases at stair in the peak hour vs. No Action Alternative	14	19	20	23	23	22	14	Yes	Mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement a monitoring plan for this location. The plan will identify a baseline, specific timing, and a threshold for additional action. If that threshold is reached, MTA NYCT will increase the escalator speed from 100 fpm to 120 fpm.	18	Yes	No additional mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement the mitigation commitments of the Final EA, including monitoring and improvements, if warranted.
			Court Sq subway station (Queens)–Stair P2/P4 to Manhattan-bound No. 7 line	Net passenger increases at stair in the peak hour vs. No Action Alternative	127	117	133	135	130	152	126	Yes	Mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement a monitoring plan for this location. The plan will identify a baseline, specific timing, and a threshold for additional action. If that threshold is reached, TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to construct a new stair from the northern end of the No. 7 platform to the street. The threshold will be set to allow for sufficient time to implement the mitigation so that the adverse effect does not occur.	122	Yes	No additional mitigation needed. TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to implement the mitigation commitments of the Final EA, including monitoring and improvements, if warranted.,

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5, Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
4D – Transportation: Parking	Parking Conditions	All tolling scenarios would result in a reduction in parking demand within the Manhattan CBD of a similar magnitude to the reduction in auto trips into the Manhattan CBD. With a shift from driving to transit, there would be increased parking demand at subway and commuter rail stations and park-and-ride facilities outside the Manhattan CBD.	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	Reduction in parking demand due to reduction in auto trips to CBD Model results do not indicate an increase in demand for parking in the area immediately surrounding the CBD							No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects
			Transit Facilities	Narrative	Small changes in parking demand at transit facilities, corresponding to increased commuter rail and subway ridership							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
4E – Transportation: Pedestrians and Bicycles	Pedestrian Circulation	Increased pedestrian activity on sidewalks outside transit hubs because of increased transit use. At all but one location in the Manhattan CBD (Herald Square/Penn Station), the increase in transit riders would not generate enough new pedestrians to adversely affect pedestrian circulation in the station area. Outside the Manhattan CBD, transit usage at individual stations would not increase enough to adversely affect pedestrian conditions on nearby sidewalks, crosswalks, or corners.	Herald Square/Penn Station NY	Sidewalks, corners, and crosswalks with pedestrian volumes above threshold in AM / PM peak periods	Adverse effects on pedestrian circulation at one sidewalk segment and two crosswalks							Yes	Mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors will implement a monitoring plan at this location. The plan will include a baseline, specific timing, and a threshold for additional action. If that threshold is reached, NYCDOT will increase pedestrian space on sidewalks and crosswalks via physical widening and/or removing or relocating obstructions.	Pedestrian volumes at key transit stations/hubs would be similar to those predicted in Final EA. Adverse effects are no longer predicted at Herald Square.	No	Mitigation is no longer needed. The Project Sponsors will implement the mitigation commitment described in the Final EA, including monitoring and improvements, if warranted, as an enhancement
	Bicycles	Small increases in bicycle trips near transit hubs and as a travel mode	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	Small increases in bicycle trips near transit hubs with highest increases in pedestrian trip share							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
			Outside Manhattan CBD	Narrative	Some shifts from automobile to bicycles							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects		No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
	Safety	No adverse effects	Overall	Narrative	No substantial increases in pedestrian volumes or increased safety concerns, including at existing identified high-crash locations. Overall, with fewer vehicular trips entering and exiting the Manhattan CBD, the CBD Tolling Alternative could result in reduced traffic volumes at these locations. This would help to reduce vehicle-vehicle and vehicle-pedestrian conflicts, leading to an overall benefit to safety.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
5A – Social Conditions: Population	Benefits	Benefits in and near the Manhattan CBD	28-county study area	Narrative	Benefits in and near the Manhattan CBD related to travel-time savings, improved travel-time reliability, reduced vehicle operating costs, improved safety, reduced air pollutant emissions, and predictable funding source for transit improvements. This would positively affect community connections and access to employment, education, healthcare, and recreation for residents.							No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects
	Community Cohesion	Changes to travel patterns, including increased use of transit, resulting from new toll	28-county study area	Narrative	Changes to travel patterns, including increased use of transit, as a result of the Project would not adversely affect community cohesion or make it more difficult for people to connect with others in their community, given the extensive transit network connecting to the Manhattan CBD and the small change in trips predicted.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects (see “Environmental Justice” for mitigation related to increased costs for low-income drivers).	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects
	Indirect Displacement	No notable changes in socioeconomic conditions or cost of living so as to induce potential involuntary displacement of residents	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	The Project would not result in the potential for indirect (involuntary) residential displacement. It would not result in substantial changes to market conditions so as to lead to changes in housing prices, given that real estate values in the Manhattan CBD are already high and the many factors that affect each household’s decisions about where to live. In addition, low-income residents of the CBD would not experience a notable increase in the cost of living as a result of the Project because of the lack of change in housing costs, the many housing units protected through New York’s rent-control, rent-stabilization, and other similar programs, the tax credit available to CBD residents with incomes of up to \$60,000, and the conclusion that the cost of goods would not increase as a result of the Project (see “Economic Conditions”).							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
	Community Facilities and Services	Increased cost for community facilities and service providers in the Manhattan CBD, their employees who drive, and clientele who drive from outside the CBD	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	The Project would increase costs for community service providers that operate vehicles into and out of the Manhattan CBD and for people who travel by vehicle to community facilities and services in the Manhattan CBD, as well as residents of the CBD and employees of community facilities who use vehicles to travel to community facilities outside the CBD. Given the wide range of travel options other than driving, the cost for users to drive to community facilities and services would not constitute an adverse effect on community facilities and services.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
	Effects on Vulnerable Social Groups	Benefits to vulnerable social groups from new funding for MTA Capital Program	28-county study area	Narrative	<p>The Project would benefit certain vulnerable social groups, including elderly populations, persons with disabilities, transit-dependent populations, and non-driver populations by creating a funding source for the MTA 2020–2024 Capital Program (and subsequent capital programs and by reducing congestion in the Manhattan CBD).</p> <p>Elderly individuals would benefit from the travel-time and reliability improvements to bus service with the CBD Tolling Alternative, as bus passengers tend to be older than riders on other forms of transit, such as the subway and, as described above, bus passengers in the Manhattan CBD would benefit from travel-time savings due to the decrease in congestion.</p> <p>People over the age of 65 with a qualifying disability receive a reduced fare on MTA subways and buses, and elderly individuals with a qualifying disability can also receive MTA’s paratransit service, including taxis and for-hire vehicles (FHV’s) operating on behalf of MTA to transport paratransit users. Elderly people with disabilities and low-income individuals who drive to the Manhattan CBD would be entitled to the same mitigation and enhancements proposed for low-income and disabled populations, in general. Other elderly individuals who drive to the Manhattan CBD would pay the toll.</p>							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
	Access to Employment	Increased cost for small number of people who drive to work	28-county study area	Narrative	Decrease in work trips by driving modes to and within the Manhattan CBD, with an offsetting increase in transit ridership. Those who drive despite the CBD toll would do so based on the need or convenience of driving and would benefit from the reduced congestion in the Manhattan CBD. Negligible effect (less than 0.1%) on travel to employment within the Manhattan CBD and reverse-commuting from the CBD due to the wide range of transit options available and the small number of commuters who drive today.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
5B – Social Conditions: Neighborhood Character	Neighborhood character	No notable change in neighborhood character	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	The changes in traffic patterns on local streets would not change the defining elements of the neighborhood character of the Manhattan CBD.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
			Area near 60th Street Manhattan CBD boundary	Narrative	Changes in parking demand near the 60th Street CBD boundary (including increases just north of 60th Street and decreases just to the south) would not create a climate of disinvestment that could lead to adverse effects on neighborhood character nor alter the defining elements of the neighborhood character of this area.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
5C – Social Conditions: Public Policy	Public policy	No effect	28-county study area	Narrative	The Project would be consistent with regional transportation plans and other public policies in place for the regional study area and the Manhattan CBD.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
6 – Economic Conditions	Benefits	Regional economic benefits	28-county study area	Narrative	Economic benefit through congestion relief in terms of travel-time savings and travel-time reliability improvements, which would increase productivity and utility, as well as safety improvements and reduced vehicle operating costs associated with reductions in congestion.							No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects
	Economic Effects of Toll Costs	Cost of new toll for workers and businesses in the CBD that rely on vehicles	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	No adverse effects to any particular industry or occupational category in the Manhattan CBD. Given the high level of transit access in the CBD and high percentage of transit share, the toll would affect only a small percentage of the overall workforce. This would not adversely affect operations of businesses in the Manhattan CBD or the viability of any business types, including the taxi/FHV industry.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects Enhancements The Project Sponsors commit to establishing a Small Business Working Group (SBWG) that will meet 6 months prior and 6 months after Project implementation, and annually thereafter, to solicit ongoing input on whether and how businesses are being affected. As part of mitigation for other topics, TBTA will ensure the overnight toll for trucks and other vehicles is reduced to at or below 50 percent of the peak toll from at least 12:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. in the final CBD toll structure; this will also benefit some workers and businesses.	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects The Project Sponsors will implement the Enhancements described in the Final EA.
	Price of Goods	Cost of new toll would not result in changes in the cost of most consumer goods	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	Not anticipated to result in meaningful change in cost for most consumer goods. Any cost increase associated with the new toll in the CBD Tolling Alternative that would be passed along to receiving businesses would be distributed among several customers per toll charge (since trucks make multiple deliveries) especially for businesses, including small businesses and micro-businesses, receiving smaller deliveries. This would minimize the cost to any individual business. Some commodity sectors (construction materials, electronics, beverages) are more prone to increases due to less competition within delivery market.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
	Taxi and FHV Industry*	Depending on the tolling scenario, the toll could reduce taxi and FHV revenues due to a reduction in taxi/FHV VMT with passengers within the CBD. While this could adversely affect individual drivers (see “Environmental Justice”), the industry would remain viable overall.	28-county study area	Net change in daily taxi/FHV VMT regionwide	-126,993 (-2.9%)	-14,028 (-0.3%)	-73,413 (-1.7%)	-217,477 (-5.0%)	-116,065 (-2.7%)	-4,888 (-1.0%)	-137,815 (-3.2%)	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects (see “Environmental Justice” for mitigation related to effects on taxi and FHV drivers).	-30,963 (-0.7%)	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects
				Net change in daily taxi/FHV VMT in the CBD	-21,498 (-6.6%)	+15,020 (+4.6%)	-11,371 (-3.5%)	-54,476 (-16.8%)	-25,621 (-7.9%)	+4,962 (+1.5%)	-27,757 (-8.6%)			-904 (-0.3%)		
	Local Economic Effects	Changes in parking demand near the 60th Street CBD boundary	Area near 60th Street Manhattan CBD boundary	Narrative	Changes in parking demand near the 60th Street Manhattan CBD boundary (including increases just north of 60th Street and decreases just to the south) could jeopardize the viability of one or more parking facilities in the area south of 60th Street but would not create a climate of disinvestment that could lead to adverse effects on neighborhood character.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects

Note:

- * The Final EA provides information on the types of vehicles licensed by the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC) in Chapter 6, “Economic Conditions,” Section 6.3.2.6, on page 6-32. These include yellow cabs, for which TLC has issued medallions; green cabs, which are street-hail livery cabs that begin their trips outside the core service area of Manhattan; and FHV’s, which provide pre-arranged service. Vehicles licensed as app-based, or high-volume, FHV’s operate from bases that dispatch more than 10,000 trips a day. (<https://www.nyc.gov/site/tlc/businesses/high-volume-for-hire-services.page>). Currently there are two TLC-licensed high-volume FHV’s: Lyft and Uber. In this reevaluation document and the Final EA, the term “taxi” is used to refer to yellow cabs, green cabs, and FHV’s that are not high-volume FHV’s and the term “FHV” refers to app-based, high-volume FHV’s (i.e., Lyft and Uber).

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
7 – Parks and Recreational Resources		New tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, and signage in the southern portion of Central Park	Manhattan CBD	Narrative	The Project would replace four existing streetlight poles at three detection locations in Central Park near 59th Street and on two adjacent sidewalks outside the park’s wall. These poles would be in the same locations as existing poles and would not reduce the amount of park space or affect the features and activities of the park. The Project would also place tolling infrastructure beneath the structure of the High Line, outside the park area atop the High Line structure. Following consideration of public input received during the public comment period, FHWA concluded that the CBD Tolling Alternative would have a <i>de minimis</i> impact on Central Park and the High Line.							No	No mitigation needed. Refer to Chapter 7, “Parks and Recreational Resources,” for a listing of measures to avoid adverse effects to parks.	Same as Final EA. No change proposed to new tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, or signage.	No	No mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors will implement measures described in the Final EA.
8 – Historic and Cultural Resources		New tolling infrastructure and tolling system equipment on or near historic properties	45 historic properties within the Project’s Area of Potential Effects (APE)	Narrative	Based on a review of the Project in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, FHWA has determined that the Project would have No Adverse Effect on historic properties and the State Historic Preservation Office has concurred.							No	No mitigation needed. Refer to Chapter 8, “Historic and Cultural Resources,” for a listing of measures to avoid adverse effects to historic properties.	Same as Final EA. No change proposed to new tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, or signage.	No	No mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors will implement the measures described in the Final EA.
9 – Visual Resources		Changes in visual environment resulting from new tolling infrastructure and tolling system equipment	Area of visual effect	Narrative	Infrastructure and equipment would be similar in form to streetlight poles, sign poles, or similar structures already in use throughout New York City. Cameras included in the array of tolling system equipment would use infrared illumination at night to allow images of license plates to be collected without any need for visible light. The Project would have a neutral effect on viewer groups and no adverse effect on visual resources							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	Same as Final EA. No change proposed to new tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, or signage.	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects.

Table 1.1 - Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
10 – Air Quality	Increases or decreases in emissions related to truck traffic diversions	Cross Bronx Expressway at Macombs Road, Bronx, NY		Increase or decrease in Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)	3,901	3,996	2,056	1,766	3,757	2,188	3,255	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects Enhancements 1. Refer to the overall enhancement on monitoring at the end of this table. 2. TBTA will work with the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) to expand the existing network of sensors to monitor priority locations and supplement a smaller number of real-time PM _{2.5} monitors to provide insight into time-of-day patterns to determine whether the changes in air pollution can be attributed to changes in traffic occurring after implementation of the Project. The Project Sponsors will select the additional monitoring locations in consideration of air quality analysis in the EA and input from environmental justice stakeholders. NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and other agencies conducting monitoring will also be consulted prior to finalizing the monitoring approach. The Project Sponsors will monitor air quality prior to implementation (setting a baseline), and two years following implementation. Following the initial two-year post-implementation analysis period, and separate from ongoing air quality monitoring and reporting, the Project Sponsors will assess the magnitude and variability of changes in air quality to determine whether more monitoring sites are necessary. Data collected throughout the monitoring program will be made available publicly as data becomes available and analysis is completed. Data from the real-time monitors will be available online continuously from the start of pre-implementation monitoring.	3,917	No	No mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors are maintaining their commitment to implement the enhancement measures identified in the Final EA and FONSI.
				Percent change in AADT compared to No Action Alternative	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%			2%		
				Increase or decrease in daily number of trucks	509	704	170	510	378	536	50			433		
				Percent change in daily number of trucks compared to No Action Alternative	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%			2%		
				Potential adverse air quality effects from truck diversions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No			No		
		I-95, Bergen County, NJ		Increase or decrease in AADT	9,843	11,459	7,980	5,003	7,078	5,842	12,506	No	3. MTA is currently transitioning its fleet to zero-emission buses, which will reduce air pollutants and improve air quality near bus depots and along bus routes. MTA is committed to prioritizing traditionally underserved communities and those impacted by poor air quality and climate change and has developed an approach that actively incorporates these priorities in the deployment phasing process of the transition. Based on feedback received during the outreach conducted for the Project and concerns raised by members of environmental justice communities, TBTA coordinated with MTA NYCT, which is committed to prioritizing the Kingsbridge Depot and Gun Hill Depot, both located in and serving primarily environmental justice communities in Upper Manhattan and the Bronx, when electric buses are received in MTA's next major procurement of battery electric buses, which began in late 2022. This independent effort by MTA NYCT is anticipated to provide air quality benefits to the environmental justice communities in the Bronx.	10,341	No	
				Percent change in AADT compared to No Action Alternative	4%	5%	3%	2%	3%	2%	5%			4%		
				Increase or decrease in daily number of trucks	801	955	729	631	696	637	-236			499		
				Percent change in daily number of trucks compared to No Action Alternative	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-1%			1%		
				Potential adverse air quality effects from truck diversions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No			No		

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO						POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	
10 – Air Quality (Cont'd)		Increases or decreases in emissions related to truck traffic diversions (Cont'd)	RFK Bridge, NY	Increase or decrease in AADT	18,742	19,440	19,860	19,932	20,465	20,391	21,006	No	See above	20,273	No	No mitigation needed. The Project Sponsors are maintaining their commitment to implement the enhancement measures identified in the Final EA and FONSI.
				Percent change in AADT compared to No Action Alternative	13%	14%	14%	14%	15%	15%	15%			14%		
				Increase or decrease in daily number of trucks	2,257	2,423	2,820	3,479	4,116	3,045	432			2,433		
				Percent change in daily number of trucks compared to No Action Alternative	15%	16%	18%	22%	27%	20%	3%			16%		
				Potential adverse air quality effects from truck diversions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No			No		

Table 1.1 - Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
11 – Energy		Reductions in regional energy consumption	12-county study area	Narrative	Reductions in regional VMT would reduce energy consumption							No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects	Same as Final EA	No	No mitigation needed. Beneficial effects
12 – Noise		Imperceptible increases or decreases in noise levels resulting from changes in traffic volumes	Bridge and tunnel crossings	Narrative	The maximum noise level increases (2.9 A-weighted decibels, or dB(A)), which were predicted adjacent to the Queens-Midtown Tunnel in Tolling Scenario D, would not be perceptible.							No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects	The maximum predicted noise level increase (0.5 dB(A)), at Robert F. Kennedy (RFK) Bridge in Manhattan, would not be perceptible.	No	No mitigation needed. No adverse effects. The Project Sponsors are maintaining their commitment to implement the enhancement measures identified in the Final EA and FONSI.
			Local streets	Narrative	Tolling Scenario C was used to assess noise level changes in Downtown Brooklyn, Tolling Scenario D was used at all other locations assessed. The maximum predicted noise level increases (2.5 dB(A)), which were at Trinity Place and Edgar Street, would not be perceptible. There was no predicted increase in noise levels in the Downtown Brooklyn locations.							No	Enhancement Refer to the overall enhancement on monitoring at the end of this table.	The maximum predicted noise level increases (2.8 dB(A)), at W. 179th St / Broadway, would not be perceptible.	No	

Table 1.1. Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
13 – Natural Resources		Construction activities to install tolling infrastructure near natural resources	Sites of tolling infrastructure and tolling system equipment	Narrative	No effects on surface waters, wetlands, or floodplains. Potential effects on stormwater and ecological resources will be managed through construction commitments. The Project is consistent with coastal zone policies.							No	Refer to Chapter 13, “Natural Resources,” for a listing of construction commitments to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential negative effects.	Same as Final EA. No change proposed to new tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, or signage.	No	The Project Sponsors will implement the construction commitments described in the Final EA.
14 – Hazardous Waste		Potential for disturbance of existing contaminated or hazardous materials during construction	Sites of tolling infrastructure and tolling system equipment	Narrative	Soil disturbance during construction and the potential alteration, removal, or disturbance of existing roadway infrastructure and utilities that could contain asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, or other hazardous substances. Potential effects will be managed through construction commitments.							No	Refer to Chapter 14, “Asbestos-Containing Materials, Lead-Based Paint, Hazardous Wastes, and Contaminated Materials,” for a listing of construction commitments to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential negative effects.	Same as Final EA. No change proposed to new tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, or signage.	No	The Project Sponsors will implement the construction commitments described in the Final EA.
15 – Construction Effects		Potential disruption related to construction for installation of tolling infrastructure	Sites of tolling infrastructure and tolling system equipment	Narrative	Temporary disruptions to traffic and pedestrian patterns, and noise from construction activities, with a duration of less than one year overall, and approximately two weeks at any given location. These effects will be managed through construction commitments.							No	Refer to Chapter 15, “Construction Effects,” for a listing of construction commitments to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential negative effects.	Same as Final EA. No change proposed to construction for new tolling infrastructure, tolling system equipment, or signage.	No	The Project Sponsors will implement the construction commitments described in the Final EA.

Table 1.1. Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
17 – Environmental Justice	Low-income drivers	The EA as published in August 2022 found the increased cost to drivers with the new CBD toll would disproportionately affect low-income drivers to the Manhattan CBD who do not have a reasonable alternative for reaching the Manhattan CBD. With further analysis of the population affected and the addition of new mitigation, the Final EA concludes there would not be a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low-income drivers.	28-county study area	Narrative	The increased cost to drivers would occur under all tolling scenarios.							Yes	<p>Mitigation needed. The Project will include a tax credit for CBD tolls paid by residents of the Manhattan CBD whose New York adjusted gross income for the taxable year is less than \$60,000. TBTA will coordinate with the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance (NYS DTF) to ensure availability of documentation needed for drivers eligible for the NYS tax credit.</p> <p>TBTA will post information related to the tax credit on the Project website, with a link to the appropriate location on the NYS DTF website to guide eligible drivers to information on claiming the credit.</p> <p>TBTA will eliminate the \$10 refundable deposit currently required for E-ZPass customers who do not have a credit card linked to their account, and which is sometimes a barrier to access.</p> <p>TBTA will provide enhanced promotion of existing E-ZPass payment and plan options, including the ability for drivers to pay per trip (rather than a pre-loaded balance), refill their accounts with cash at participating retail locations, and discount plans already in place, about which they may not be aware.</p> <p>TBTA will coordinate with MTA to provide outreach and education on eligibility for existing discounted transit fare products and programs, including those for individuals 65 years of age and older, those with disabilities, and those with low incomes, about which many may not be aware.</p> <p>The Project Sponsors commit to establishing an Environmental Justice Community Group that will meet on a quarterly basis, with the first meeting taking place prior to Project implementation, to share updated data and analysis and hear about potential concerns. As it relates to environmental justice, the Project Sponsors will continue providing meaningful opportunities for participation and engagement by sharing updated data and analysis, listening to concerns, and seeking feedback on the toll setting process.</p> <p>TBTA will ensure the overnight toll for trucks and other vehicles is reduced to at or below 50 percent of the peak toll from at least 12:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. in the final CBD toll structure; this will benefit low-income drivers who travel during that time.</p> <p>For five years, TBTA commits to a Low-Income Discount Plan for low-income frequent drivers who will benefit from a 25 percent discount on the full CBD E-ZPass toll rate for the applicable time of day after the first 10 trips in each calendar month (not including the overnight period, which will already be deeply discounted).</p> <p>Enhancement</p> <p>TBTA will coordinate with MTA NYCT to improve bus service in areas identified in the EA as the Brooklyn and Manhattan Bus Network Redesigns move forward.</p>	Incorporating the identified mitigation, no disproportionately high and adverse effect would occur on low-income drivers.	Yes	<p>No change in identified mitigation needed. The adopted toll structure incorporates and expands the mitigation commitments of the Final EA and FONSI.</p> <p>The adopted toll structure includes an overnight toll for trucks and other vehicles at 25 percent of the peak toll from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m. on weekdays and 9 p.m. to 9 a.m. on weekends.</p> <p>The adopted toll structure commits, for five years to a Low-Income Discount Plan for low-income frequent drivers who will benefit from a 50 percent discount on the full CBD E-ZPass toll rate for the applicable time of day after the first 10 trips in each calendar month (not including the overnight period, which will already be deeply discounted).</p>

Table 1.1. Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
17 – Environmental Justice	Taxi and FHV drivers*	The EA as published in August 2022 found a potential disproportionately high and adverse effect would occur to taxi and FHV drivers in New York City, who largely identify as minority populations, in tolling scenarios that toll their vehicles more than once a day. This would occur in unmodified Tolling Scenarios A, D, and G; for FHV drivers, it would also occur in Tolling Scenarios C and E. The adverse effect would be related to the cost of the new CBD toll and the reduction of VMT for taxis and FHV, which would result in a decrease in revenues that could lead to losses in employment. With the addition of new mitigation, the Final EA concludes there would not be a disproportionately high and adverse effect on taxi and FHV drivers.	New York City	Narrative	Potential adverse effect would occur in Tolling Scenarios A, D, and G, which would not have caps or exemptions for taxis and FHV drivers.							Yes	Mitigation needed. TBTA will ensure that a toll structure with tolls of no more than once per day for taxis or FHV is included in the final CBD toll structure.	No disproportionately high and adverse effect would occur on New York City taxi and FHV drivers with the adopted toll structure, which includes a per-trip toll on trips to, within, or from the CBD of \$1.25 for taxis and \$2.50 for FHV. These per-trip tolls are equivalent to the once per day toll for passenger vehicles included as part of the adopted toll structure.	No	Based on the average number of trips taxis and FHV make each day, the toll amount for taxis and FHV is equivalent to the once-daily toll rate for automobiles. In addition, the adopted toll structure requires the cost of the toll to be paid by the passenger rather than the taxi or FHV driver.*
				Change in daily taxi/FHV VMT with passengers in the CBD relative to No Action Alternative: Scenarios included in EA	-21,498 (-6.6%)	+15,020 (+4.6%)	-11,371 (-3.5%)	-54,476 (-16.8%)	-25,621 (-7.9%)	+4,962 (+1.5%)	-27,757 (-8.6%)			-904 (-0.3%)		
				Net change in daily taxi/FHV trips to CBD relative to scenarios included in EA: Additional analysis to assess effects of caps or exemptions	Tolls capped at 1x / Day: +2%	—	—	Tolls capped at 1x / Day: +3% Exempt: +50%	—	—	Tolls capped at 1x / Day: +2%			NA		

Note:
* The Final EA provides information on the types of vehicles licensed by the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission (TLC) in Chapter 6, “Economic Conditions,” Section 6.3.2.6, on page 6-32. These include yellow cabs, for which TLC has issued medallions; green cabs, which are street-hail livery cabs that begin their trips outside the core service area of Manhattan; and FHV, which provide pre-arranged service. Vehicles licensed as app-based, or high-volume, FHV operate from bases that dispatch more than 10,000 trips a day. (<https://www.nyc.gov/site/tlc/businesses/high-volume-for-hire-services.page>). Currently there are two TLC-licensed high-volume FHV: Lyft and Uber. In this reevaluation document and the Final EA, the term “taxi” is used to refer to yellow cabs, green cabs, and FHV that are not high-volume FHV and the term “FHV” refers to app-based, high-volume FHV (i.e., Lyft and Uber).

Table 1.1. Modified Final EA Table ES-5. Summary of Benefits and Effects for the CBD Tolling Alternative with Comparison of Tolling Scenarios – with the Adopted Toll Structure Added

EA CHAPTER	TOPIC	SUMMARY OF EFFECTS	LOCATION	DATA SHOWN IN TABLE	FINAL EA TOLLING SCENARIO							POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS	ADOPTED TOLL STRUCTURE	POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT	MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENTS
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G					
17 – Environmental Justice (Cont'd)	Increases or decreases in traffic, as a result of traffic diversions, in communities already overburdened by pre-existing air pollution and chronic diseases	Certain environmental justice communities would benefit from decreased traffic; some communities that are already overburdened by pre-existing air pollution and chronic diseases could see an adverse effect as a result of increased traffic.	The specific census tracts that would experience increased or decreased traffic change slightly depending on the tolling scenario. The following communities could have census tracts that merit place-based mitigation: High Bridge–Morrisania, Crotona–Tremont, Hunts Point–Mott Haven, Pelham–Throgs Neck, Northeast Bronx, East Harlem, Randall’s Island, Lower East Side/Lower Manhattan, Downtown Brooklyn–Fort Greene, South Williamsburg, Orange, East Orange, Newark, and Fort Lee.	Narrative	Census tracts with pre-existing air pollutant and chronic disease burdens that would benefit from reduced traffic, and those affected by increased traffic would vary somewhat, but the identified communities remain largely the same across tolling scenarios. Under Tolling Scenario G, Fort Lee would not experience increases.							Yes	<p>Mitigation needed.</p> <p>Regional Mitigation</p> <p>TBTA will ensure the overnight toll for trucks and other vehicles is reduced to at or below 50 percent of the peak toll from at least 12:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. in the final toll structure; this will reduce truck diversions.</p> <p>NYCDOT will expand the NYC Clean Trucks Program to accelerate the replacement of eligible diesel trucks, which travel on highways in certain environmental justice communities where the Project is projected to increase truck traffic, to lower-emission electric, hybrid, compressed natural gas, and clean diesel vehicles.</p> <p>NYCDOT will expand its off-hours delivery program in locations where the Project is projected to increase truck diversions to reduce daytime truck traffic and increase roadway safety in certain environmental justice communities.</p> <p>Place-based Mitigation</p> <p>TBTA will toll vehicles traveling northbound on the FDR Drive that exit at East Houston Street and then turn to immediately travel south on FDR Drive; this will mitigate modeled non-truck traffic increases on the FDR Drive between the Brooklyn Bridge and East Houston Street.</p> <p>NYCDOT will coordinate to replace diesel-burning transport refrigeration units (TRUs) at Hunts Point with cleaner vehicles.</p> <p>NYSDOT will coordinate to expand electric truck charging infrastructure.</p> <p>The Project Sponsors will coordinate to install roadside vegetation to improve near-road air quality.</p> <p>The Project Sponsors will renovate parks and greenspaces.</p> <p>The Project Sponsors will install or upgrade air filtration units in schools.</p> <p>The Project Sponsors will coordinate to expand existing asthma case management programs and create new community-based asthma programming through a neighborhood asthma center in the Bronx.</p>	Census tracts with pre-existing air pollutant and chronic disease burdens that would benefit from reduced traffic, and those affected by increased traffic vary somewhat from the Final EA, as anticipated. <p>The communities that merit place-based mitigation remain the same as those identified in the Final EA and of the \$100m committed in place-based mitigation funds, target allocations have been made for each community as follows: Crotona–Tremont, \$22.6m; High Bridge–Morrisania, \$9.2m; Hunts Point–Mott Haven, \$18.9m; Northeast Bronx, \$4.4m; Pelham–Throgs Neck, \$16.6m; Downtown–Heights–Slope (Downtown Brooklyn–Fort Greene), \$5.7m; Greenpoint (South Williamsburg), \$7.4m; East Harlem, \$4.4m; Randall’s Island, \$0.9m; Fort Lee, \$1.4m; City of Orange, \$0.9m; East Orange, \$1.8m; and Newark, \$5.7M. (See Note 2). TBTA’s place-based mitigation for Union Square - Lower East Side (Lower East Side) has no associated cost.</p>	Yes	<p>No additional mitigation needed.</p> <p>The Project Sponsors will implement the mitigation commitments of the Final EA and FONSI (listed under “Mitigation and Enhancements” in this table).</p>

Note: Based on analysis of the adopted toll structure, communities and census tracts where place-based mitigation measures will be implemented have been confirmed – the specific siting of mitigation measures is being determined through analysis of data on needs and feasibility and coordination among the Project Sponsors, the Environmental Justice Community Group (representing the 10-county environmental justice study area), and relevant stakeholders and implementing agencies; see “Benefits and Allocation of Funding for Mitigation Measures,” above.

OVERALL PROJECT ENHANCEMENT. The Project Sponsors commit to ongoing monitoring and reporting of potential effects of the Project, including for example, traffic entering the CBD, vehicle-miles traveled in the CBD; transit ridership from providers across the region; bus speeds within the CBD; air quality and emissions trends; parking; and Project revenue. Data will be collected in advance and after implementation of the Project. A formal report on the effects of the Project will be issued one year after implementation and then every two years. In addition, a reporting website will make data, analysis, and visualizations available in open data format to the greatest extent practicable. Updates will be provided on at least a bi-annual basis as data becomes available and analysis is completed. This data will also be used to support an adaptive management approach to monitoring the efficacy of mitigation, and adjustments as warranted.